REMARKS

By this amendment, applicants have cancelled claims 32-35 and amended claim 2. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 36-45 are currently pending.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Yu for the courtesy of a telephone interview with applicants' representatives Irving N. Feit and the undersigned on June 3, 2003. During the telephone interview, the rejections presented in the Office Action of March 18, 2003 were discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2, 3, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. On page 3 of the Office Action, the examiner conceded that the specification adequately describes HRGP from humans but not from other mammals.

During the telephone interview, applicants informed Examiner Yu that applicants intend to limit the claims to human HRGP. Examiner Yu stated that such a limitation would overcome the §112 rejection for alleged lack of an adequate written description.

Accordingly, applicants have added the limitation of "human" HRGP in claim 2. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 allegedly for lack of an adequate written description is moot. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the examiner rejected claims 2, 3, and 32-45 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph allegedly for lack of enablement. According to the examiner, the claims are directed to a pharmaceutical composition and inherent in the term "pharmaceutical" is *in vivo* use.

The examiner stated during the telephone interview that the specification does not teach what diseases could be treated. Applicants responded by directing the examiner's attention to page 6, second paragraph of the specification. There, cardiovascular disease is

disclosed as an example of a disease which can be treated by the present invention. Also, applicants wish to point out to the examiner that other conditions (e.g., blocked coronary blood vessels, wound healing, etc.) are disclosed in the specification. See, for example, the last paragraph on page 17 of the specification as originally filed.

The examiner then stated that *in vivo* treatment is not a trivial matter. Applicants responded by directing the examiner's attention to the *in vivo* experiment at the bottom of page 48 of the specification. There, the specification discloses that treatment of HRGP inhibits the anti-angiogenic effect of TSP-1 *in vivo*. Also, applicants wish to point out to the examiner that another *in vivo* experiment is disclosed on pages 49-51 of the specification as originally filed.

The examiner agreed that the specification provided sufficient *in vivo* efficacy data. Accordingly, the examiner stated that the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 32-45 under 35 U.S.C. §112, allegedly for lack of enablement would be withdrawn due to support in the specification for diseases and *in vivo* data.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 2, 3, and 32-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by either Koide et al. (abstract only, 1986, *Biochemistry*, vol 25, pages 2220-2225) or Saigo et al. (1989, *J. Biol. Chem.*, vol 264) as evidenced by GenBank accession number P04196 (06-15-2002).

During the telephone interview, applicants pointed out to the examiner that Koide et al. and Saigo et al. only disclose the amino acid sequence of HRGP. There is no disclosure in Koide et al. and Saigo et al. of a pharmaceutical composition containing a thrombospondin-binding motif of HRGP.

The examiner stated that she would review the cited references for disclosure of pharmaceutical compositions. The examiner agreed that if the references do not disclose or fairly suggest a pharmaceutical composition, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) would be

withdrawn.

Applicants wish to point out to the examiner that prior to the present invention, the *in vivo* physiologic function of HRGP was not known. See page 53 of the specification which states the following:

> While a number of interactions have been reported for HRGP, no *in vivo* physiologic function has been described previously for this abundant plasma protein.

Thus, prior to the discovery by the inventors of the *in vivo* physiologic function of HRGP, there was no motivation to prepare a pharmaceutical composition containing a thrombospondin-binding motif of HRGP.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

For all of the above reasons, allowance or pending claims 2, 3 and 36-45 is earnestly requested. If the examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Edna I. Gergel, Ph.D.
Registration Number 50,819
Agent for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550